

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 245 618

HE 017 343

AUTHOR Hyer, Patricia B.
TITLE Affirmative Action for Women Faculty: Case Studies of Three Successful Institutions. ASHE 1984 Annual Meeting Paper.
PUB DATE Mar 84
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (Chicago, IL, March 12-14, 1984).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Affirmative Action; Case Studies; *Change Strategies; Comparative Analysis; *Employment Practices; Higher Education; Institutional Characteristics; *Institutional Evaluation; *Personnel Policy; Professors; Tenure; *Women Faculty
IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting

ABSTRACT

Affirmative action implementation at 183 public and private doctorate-granting universities was studied. Based on high institutional scores on a change index, three universities were selected as case study sites. Factors and processes thought to account for the amount of change that occurred on behalf of women faculty on each campus during the 1970s are described. Case synopses are followed by cross-site comparisons and implications for the literature on federally-mandated change. The progress at individual universities was compared using data from National Center for Education Statistics' annual employee surveys. Change was measured by combined scores in five areas: change in the proportion of women on the faculty, change in the ratio of male to female faculty, change in the number of women on the faculty, change in the number of female full professors, and change in the number of tenured women. Open-ended interviews were also conducted with faculty, administrators, affirmative action staff, and representatives of campus-based women's organizations at the case study institutions. Findings from the case studies emphasize the importance of manipulable factors in creating positive change, especially the role of sustained effective leadership for the change effort. (SW)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED245618

HE017 343

Affirmative Action for Women Faculty:
Case Studies of Three Successful Institutions

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Patricia B.
Hyer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Patricia B. Hyer, Research Associate

Institute for Research in
Higher and Adult Education
University of Maryland

February 1984



Association for the Study of Higher Education

The George Washington University/One Dupont Circle, Suite 630/Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 298-2597

This paper was presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held at the Conrad Hilton Hotel in Chicago, Illinois, March 12-14, 1984. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

Annual Meeting—March 12-14, 1984—Conrad Hilton
Chicago, Illinois

Affirmative Action for Women Faculty:
Case Studies of Three Successful Institutions

Federal affirmative action (AA) policies have sparked much controversy in higher education but they have produced relatively minor changes in faculty composition at most universities. Study after study documents continued inequities in access to employment, promotion, tenure, and salary for women faculty and predicts little change in the 1980s given halted growth in the higher education employment sector.

Why have affirmative action policies fallen so short of their intended impact in higher education? One of the critical issues is the extent to which affirmative action policies have actually been implemented at colleges and universities. If token compliance has been the norm, then a better understanding of the complex interaction of factors that produced positive change at relatively successful institutions is much needed information.

This study, focused on affirmative action implementation at doctorate-granting universities, fits into a tradition of research on organizational change and policy implementation. Three institutions were selected as case study sites based on their high scores on a specially developed change index. The case studies describe the factors and processes thought to account for the amount of change that occurred on behalf of women faculty on each campus during the 1970s. Case synopses are followed by cross-site comparisons and implications for the literature on federally mandated change.

Organizational Change and Implementation Research

Four studies from among the vast literature on organizational change and program implementation were found to be the most helpful in developing a framework for examining affirmative action implementation on individual

campuses. Lindquist [1] and Schreirer [4] drew on the many partial and sometimes competing perspectives on organizational change and findings from their case studies of change efforts in higher education and mental health to develop more comprehensive models. Newcombe [2, 3] investigated implementation of Title IX athletic regulations at two successful and two unsuccessful institutions to develop her grounded theory of mandated academic change. Taylor [5, 6] examined the role of the staff specialist in implementing affirmative action regulations in five settings and from these case studies developed a list of impetus and enabling factors for the implementation process. Insights drawn from these four researchers were used to suggest categories of variables likely to be influential in affirmative action implementation.

Two themes were present in all four studies: the importance of leadership and adequate resources and rewards. Leadership, according to Lindquist, needs to be "initiating, guiding, involving and influential." Leaders need to combine their own initiatives with increasing attempts to involve participants in determining needs and potential solutions. Schreirer hypothesized that implementation would be facilitated if the decision-maker were in a high enforcement position over the program and that central administrators provided strong support for the project. Newcombe found that university administrators were the pivotal link between government intentions and institutional change. Presidential leadership was crucial to successful implementation. Commitment to the change effort stemmed from personal values and priorities, while the leader's effectiveness depended on his ability to create and utilize substructures (such as an affirmative action office or special committees) to implement the change and resolve conflicts. Leadership was also a factor in Taylor's case studies, particularly the behavior and attitudes of leaders and stability of the top executive.

Successful implementation also requires mechanistic and political support. Time for planning and training, dollars, facilities, staff, procedures, and incentives were mentioned by the four researchers. However, Schreirer warns that resources may be a necessary but not sufficient condition since staff can be added and money spent without making progress.

While there is relatively close agreement on the role of leadership and resources in successful implementation, the authors diverge on other factors. Participation and communication are frequently mentioned as processes facilitating a change effort, but these are defined somewhat differently by the various authors. For instance, Lindquist suggests that linkages to new ideas or new perspectives inside and outside the organization are critical and that implementors must participate in assessing their own needs and solutions if they are to develop ownership of the change effort. Schreirer agrees that implementors should be involved in the decision to adopt an innovation and hypothesizes that more vertical and horizontal communication would facilitate implementation. Newcombe and Taylor address these issues only indirectly. Taylor found that coalition groups heightened awareness and made demands and that effective affirmative action officers had an "early warning system" to alert them to impending problems. These two observations emphasize the usefulness of upward communication in resolving implementation difficulties and creating pressure for change. Title IX implementation was facilitated where special substructures were created and networks developed to communicate policy and strategies.

The external environment is viewed differently as well. Lindquist and Newcombe tend to define external influences quite narrowly. The external environment is a source of new ideas and consultants for Lindquist. Newcombe noted linkages to national organizations as a potential influence on

presidential commitment and further isolated government intervention as a variable in federally mandated change. Taylor and Schreirer view environmental influences on implementation more broadly. According to Schreirer, a new program needs a favorable operating context of beneficiaries, supporters, competing devices, and regulators in order to be successfully implemented. Taylor's case studies suggest that affirmative action implementation is affected by social milieu, government action, competitors' actions, and availability of women and minorities.

While Lindquist's adaptive development model and Schreirer's program implementation model suggest certain components of a successful planned change effort, Newcombe's work reminds us that change mandated by the federal government and unaccompanied by resources for implementation may present a special set of circumstances. Newcombe and Taylor both provide clues to specific variables operating under these conditions. Based on the findings of these studies, four issues were selected for investigation in the case studies: 1) the source and nature of leadership for affirmative action; 2) the nature and extent of government intervention; 3) the nature and extent of coalition group activity on behalf of women faculty; and, 4) structural and/or environmental influences on affirmative action implementation.

Methodology

Universities included in this study were the 183 public and private institutions classified by the Carnegie Council (1976) as doctorate-granting. A method for comparing progress made by the individual universities was developed using data from the annual employee surveys conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics. The Higher Education General Information Surveys provide information on the number of men and women by rank on the full-time instructional faculties of all U.S. postsecondary

institutions. It does not include information on racial background or discipline affiliation.

The amount of positive change made on behalf of faculty women at each institution was measured by comparing combined scores in five areas: change in the proportion of women on the faculty, change in the ratio of male to female faculty, change in the number of women on the faculty, change in the number of female full professors, and change in the number of tenured women. Progress on the first four of the variables was assessed by comparing 1980-81 data to base-year data (1971 or 1972). Tenure data was collected for the first time in 1974. Thus, the comparison years for the fifth variable were 1980-81 and 1974-75. In each case, the variable represented the percent of increase (or decrease). The scores were then standardized and summed to yield a composite change index. One hundred fifty-nine of the 183 institutions had sufficient longitudinal information to calculate the five change scores and the combined change index.

Institutions were then rank-ordered on the basis of their change index and the top three institutions selected as case study sites. In addition to their high scores, these particular institutions had had a steady growth in the number of women faculty over the decade (an important concern since annual fluctuations were not captured by the index), a sufficiently large number of women to indicate substantive change (at least 40 women), and a contact person willing to assist by naming potential interviewees and sharing documents. All three universities eventually granted permission for a week of on-site interviewing.

Open-ended, audio-taped interviews were conducted with current and past affirmative action officers, the president and/or key top-level administrators, faculty and administrators who had been involved in the development and

administration of the affirmative action plan, and representatives of the women's organization on each campus. In addition to their views on what factors accounted for the extent of positive change that had occurred for women faculty, interviewees were asked to describe those aspects of the AA implementation effort they knew best. The case studies draw on data from these interviews, written reports and historical documents collected at the site, and observations made during the week-long visits.

Case Sites in Brief

CKSU

CKSU is a large public university located in a southern state. Its programs reflect its long heritage as a landgrant institution with considerable strength in engineering, agriculture, forestry and textiles. The creation of the degree-granting School of Liberal Arts and state permission to admit female undergraduates in the early 60s brought greater balance to the curriculum and student body. Current enrollment is about 22,000; approximately 30% of the students are female.

Using figures reflecting the number of faculty at all ranks who have more than 50 percent of their salaries charged to the teaching budget, the percentage of full-time female faculty rose steadily from seven percent in 1972-73 to 17.5 percent in 1980-81. The total number of female full professors inched upward from one to seven (.5% to 2.4% of full professors) and the number of tenured female faculty almost tripled from 12 to 35 (between 1974 and 1980). Using figures which include faculty assigned to research or extension reduces the 10.5 percent increase from 1972 to 1980 to 4.4 percent. While half of the female faculty hold appointments in the School of Humanities and Social Sciences, progress has been made in recruiting women in disciplines where availability is very low, including engineering, forestry and textiles.

A constellation of factors was responsible for the institution's progress in hiring and promoting women. The three factors most often cited by campus interviewees were commitment and leadership by the Provost, federal pressure on the issue of racial duality, and women speaking out on their own behalf. Structural and environmental changes played an important supporting role in facilitating affirmative action implementation.

The perception of the Provost as committed to affirmative action is remarkably consistent across campus. One reason is the consistency of his behavior and rhetoric. Another is widespread recognition that decision makers will be held accountable for decisions which do not help the institution achieve its affirmative action goals.

The Provost's effectiveness as a change agent was greatly enhanced by his choice of a low-key black faculty member as Assistant Provost with responsibility for affirmative action. Together they provided leadership and attention to affirmative action implementation on campus.

External pressure from the federal government looms large in this case. Indeed, there is little evidence of self-examination, policy planning, or administrative action prior to a compliance review by the regional Office for Civil Rights in 1972. Although federal intervention was omnipresent throughout the decade because of investigations related to desegregation, it seems to have had its greatest impact in generating the early and sustained commitment of the Provost to affirmative action implementation.

Federal activity on behalf of blacks had positive consequences for white women since they were well represented in the pool of recent doctorates in the humanities and social sciences. Once the most blatant forms of discrimination were removed, their applications were seriously considered.

Women faculty were also influential in the change process. The major advocacy group for women began activity in 1973 as a standing committee of the campus AAUP. It is a loosely structured pressure and support group focusing primarily on salary inequities and meeting annually with the Provost to press their issues. Two well-respected, tenured women are recognized as the long-time leaders and spokeswomen for the organization, a role they accept in order to protect untenured junior women.

While the extent of the organization's influence is debated among its own members, the Provost and his associates speak as if they are a force to be reckoned with, particularly because of its competent leaders. They have helped raise the awareness level of many on campus by identifying and publicizing specific concerns and by providing information and moral support for individual women questioning inequitable treatment.

Recruitment of female faculty has been facilitated by structural changes at the university and by changes in the community surrounding it. Expansion of the university as a whole, and of the School of Humanities and Social Sciences in particular, during the 1960s and 70s meant opportunities to add faculty in disciplines where women were readily available. The increase in size was accompanied by gradual upgrading of faculty quality. Localized recruitment was replaced by national searches which produced some excellent female candidates in the humanities and social sciences. An influx of a highly educated, cosmopolitan workforce in the region made new demands on the university, offered professional opportunities for spouses, and provided greater acceptance of professional roles for women and minorities. Finally, the rapid increase of female students particularly in nontraditional disciplines brought gradual changes in the views of male faculty regarding female achievement in the sciences and the need for female faculty role models.

In sum, affirmative action mandates received serious consideration and crucial leadership from the Provost at CKSU, who in turn hired an effective associate to assist in implementation efforts. The number of women increased over the decade in large part by halting active discrimination and holding decision makers accountable. Pressure from faculty women reinforced administrative commitment. Women also benefitted directly and indirectly from changes occurring at CKSU. Expansion of the nonscience disciplines, a change from local/parochial to national orientation, an increase in female student enrollments, and government pressure to racially integrate the university had a positive impact on female hiring.

Denby College

Denby College is a private liberal arts college in rural New England with a student body of 4,000. The College (with a capital C) is dominated by the college (with a small c) of Arts and Sciences, its undergraduate liberal arts component. This reflects the institution's commitment to providing a strong liberal arts background for the nation's future leaders. Graduate programs in medicine, business and engineering enroll about ten percent of the students.

Diversification of the student body was and continues to be viewed as an important educational goal. Over time the definition has expanded from geographic to economic and racial diversity, and most recently the acceptance of women. A limited number of women were admitted for the first time in 1971 and a policy of gender-blind admissions was eventually adopted in 1979. The freshman class of 1982 was 43 percent women.

Faculty composition also changed. The number of women on the combined faculties of Arts and Sciences, Business and Engineering increased from 12 in 1971-72 to 72 in 1981-82. The percentage of women increased from 3.7 percent

to 20.8 percent. Given the recent appointment of junior women, the number of tenured women rose slowly through most of the 1970s, from one in 1971-72 to 13 in 1981-82.

The consistency of responses by interviewees to the question, "What accounts for Denby's success?" was striking. The past President was credited for providing strong, effective leadership for affirmative action issues during his eleven-year term by all interviewees. Leadership and energy also emanated from women faculty. The move to coeducation in 1972 and a change to year-round operation, which created some new faculty positions, were closely tied to affirmative action progress. Good faith efforts on the part of many faculty members were important in carrying out the President's commitment. These factors are described more fully below.

The principal change agent at Denby College was its exceptionally capable President who served from 1970 through 1981. Under his leadership, the College set out to diversify its student body, faculty, and administration and restructure its calendar. Aspects of these three reforms--coeducation, affirmative action and year-round operation--were closely related and mutually supportive.

How did he exercise leadership for affirmative action throughout his tenure? In addition to retaining a personal interest in implementation efforts, the President made effective use of three closely related strategies: two-way communication, creation and support of affirmative action substructures, and trustee involvement. The President set firm expectations and standards for performance. Affirmative action goals and progress in meeting them were given high visibility in speeches, meetings, and reports. He was also open to and seriously considered concerns of various college constituencies. This led to a general sense that working through the system could be productive in resolving problems as they were identified.

The President gave much of the credit for Denby's progress to its exceptionally competent affirmative action officers. These officers reported directly to the President, met with him regularly, and had the power to stop a search if they were not satisfied that a good faith effort had been made.

Unlike CKSU, federal government pressure had little or no impact on the decision to adopt and implement affirmative action policies. The College had already drafted an affirmative action plan before one was requested by HEW in which the Trustees agreed to ambitious hiring goals for the College for the 1970s.

Although the number of women on the faculty before the move to coeducation was very small--only one tenured and about a dozen in part-time and/or non-tenure track jobs--they organized early on and effectively presented their concerns. Administrators have been responsive to some, though not all, of the articulated problems. The impact of feminist activism was clearly enhanced by the leadership of a handful of truly first-rate senior women. Not only did these women fight all the "bloody battles," but their intellectual strength and reputation as faculty scholars meant their voices could not be dismissed.

The coalition group working on behalf of women faculty has been instrumental in identifying problems, pressuring for equitable treatment and working conditions and providing support and encouragement to its own members. Maternity leave policies, appointment of senior women officers, child care, spouse employment policies, development of a women's studies program, sex bias in teaching evaluations, and attrition are some of the major issues they have worked on. Their concerns have led to official studies, new policy proposals, and better communication and enforcement of existing policies. Their work was often coordinated with efforts from the Affirmative Action Office.

The move to coeducation was an important impetus to hiring more women faculty members. The importance of role models for all students is taken very seriously at Denby and the faculty recognized that the admission of women students carried a commitment to better balance on the faculty as well. Since opposition to coeducation among alumni was very strong, Denby's president urged adoption of a year-round calendar which would allow the College to admit some women without reducing the number of men. Faculty expansion took place between 1972 and 1976, however women's share of faculty positions has continued to grow. About one-third of all new faculty appointments between 1977 and 1981 went to women.

The case of Denby College raises interesting and troubling questions however. In 1981, there was a change of both president and affirmative action officer. The loss of these two very committed and effective leaders and apparent differences in style and priorities of their successors has had an unsettling effect on affirmative action implementation. Perceptions of vulnerability and "backsliding" raise questions about the degree of institutionalization of the reform and the extent to which it can be sustained under anything less than ideal conditions. Is affirmative action implementation so dependent on the deep commitment and exceptional skills of a few key actors that new leaders any less committed or skilled will have difficulty sustaining progress? Is there no point at which policies and structures can be judged adequate and affirmative action aims sufficiently internalized that some of the consuming attention and resources devoted to implementation can be withdrawn without threatening gains already made? These questions were certainly on the minds of those who were involved in the reform effort over the last decade and those who are trying to determine its appropriate priority in the future of Denby College.

Newton University

Newton University is one of the nation's premier private research universities. The curriculum is heavily oriented toward science and engineering and over half of Newton's 9500 students are enrolled in graduate programs.

Although Newton University has been coeducational for more than a century, women students were nearly invisible for most of this time. Admission quotas kept women at one or two percent of the enrollment between 1919 and 1960. A gift of a dormitory for women students was made in the early 60s expanding their numbers somewhat, but adoption of equal admission standards in 1971 created even greater change. By 1981-82, 21% of the undergraduates and 18% of the graduate students were women.

Newton considers its record in hiring and promoting women faculty in non-traditional disciplines as "one of the least bad" when compared to institutions of similar prestige and orientation. There were only 17 women on the faculty in 1970, less than two percent of the total. By 1980, the number had grown to 85 and the percentage increased to 8.8 percent. Five women were tenured in 1972; 42 had tenure in 1982. Significant progress has been made in disciplines where availability is very low: engineering retained the two women it had in 1970 and added 11 more; the sciences report 15 additional women, including six in physics.

The major themes in this case present similarities and differences with the other two. A threat to withhold federal funds was the mobilizing force for development of the first "modern" affirmative action plan at Newton University. Given the university's dependence on federal funds, the national climate in the early 70s, and personal convictions, administrators made a decision to respond within the 30-day deadline. They produced an extensive document which included hiring goals for the multiplicity of departments

and laboratories at the University. The commitment to affirmative action was sufficiently strong that additional government pressure was rarely needed to sustain implementation efforts.

Strong leadership was a vital part of Newton's affirmative action implementation efforts. Three administrators--the past President, the past Chancellor (and current President), and the past Provost--were identified by many interviewees as especially influential. This team, in place throughout most of the 1970s, along with a few department heads and faculty members, were the "trendsetters, movers, and shakers" at Newton. The power held by these leaders emanated from their reputations as scholars and scientists as well as the formal authority vested in their positions.

Leadership for affirmative action was exercised in several ways: staff positions were created to deal with affirmative action issues; a centralized management structure facilitated monitoring and implementation; and AA goals were given visibility and priority.

Both male and female interviewees cited the important role women played in improving their own status. The handful of women faculty on campus during the 60s and early 70s were an extraordinary group with visibility and influence far beyond their tiny numbers. Two or three senior women scientists played an especially active role in influencing events and policies of importance to women faculty and students. These women had the clout and autonomy shared by senior male colleagues who had succeeded in the highly competitive environment at Newton. Power and legitimacy for coalition groups working on behalf of women were enhanced by the status and competence of the leaders and by their explicit efforts to identify common concerns for all women associated with the university.

Two aspects of the university culture appear to have facilitated affirmative action implementation. The first is Newton's reputation as a first-rate university and a leader in "designing the future." Being one of the best necessarily means setting and achieving exceptionally high standards in those areas the university chooses to pursue. This helped create high expectations for affirmative action performance as well as other areas. Second is the objective orientation of the institution. One manifestation of that orientation is a willingness to treat affirmative action as a problem with a solution. The engineering mentality, claimed one interviewee, meant AA was approached like any other problem by tinkering with the mechanism until it worked. In addition, an objective, data-driven mindset helped some women achieve acceptance at Newton because the quality of their work could not be denied.

Thus, several key factors accounted for Newton's success in hiring and promoting women faculty. Leadership provided by the President and a cadre of top administrators was crucial to implementation efforts. Federal intervention helped secure their commitment in the early stages of adoption of the mandate. Women worked to effect change through participation in women's organizations, networks, and other forums, as well as on their jobs. Policy and program changes resulted from their individual and collective efforts. A competent affirmative action staff monitored progress and resolved implementation difficulties. Other factors, such as the increase in women students, aspects of the institutional culture, and the goodfaith efforts of many on campus, played a supporting role.

Cross-Site Comparisons

The three selected sites proved to be a diverse collection of institutions. Denby College and Newton University are both private institutions with

long-established reputations for excellence. Yet Denby's reputation is built on the strength of its undergraduate education in the liberal arts, while Newton exerts its leadership in graduate education and research in science and technology. CKSU is a public landgrant institution. Its growing size and sophistication are typical of recent dramatic changes occurring at some southern universities.

Concerning affirmative action implementation, it is apparent that Denby and Newton confronted the problem earlier, more thoroughly, and with somewhat more success than CKSU. Both Denby and Newton had precursor programs in the 60s focused on increasing black participation and these earlier experiences facilitated the change in attitude and structures required by Revised Order 4 in 1972. CKSU appears to have responded to affirmative action mandates later and with a history of greater resistance. Their current policies and programs are less numerous, comprehensive, and progressive than those at Denby or Newton.

Despite these differences, an important finding of the case studies was the mere existence of identifiable, effective affirmative action programs on all three campuses. The level of effort devoted to AA implementation on each campus was substantial. The degree of success they had achieved was largely credited to the leadership and commitment of top administrators.

Leadership for Affirmative Action Implementation

Findings from this study support Newcombe's (1981) conclusion that leadership of a central administrator is a significant factor in differentiating successful and unsuccessful implementation of a federal mandate. Dimensions of this variable noted by both Newcombe and Taylor (1981)--including values and priorities, leadership style, behavior, and stability--were evident in these cases as well.

Leadership of a top administrator was identified more frequently than any other factor at the three institutions in this study. At CKSU, leadership was provided by the Provost. The key change agent at Denby College was the President, and the past and current Presidents were instrumental in guiding reform efforts at Newton University. There were more similarities than differences in the way leadership was exercised by these men. Findings common to all three institutions were:

1. Leaders were perceived as personally committed to affirmative action principles and implementation.
2. AA was accorded high visibility in their administrations. Leaders repeatedly discussed AA goals and their progress in achieving them in public speeches and informal gatherings.
3. AA was treated as an important institutional priority. Resources and staff were dedicated to implementation efforts. Staff roles were created and filled by competent members of protected groups who reported directly to the key change agent and operated with his full support.
4. Hiring decisions were closely monitored and decision makers held accountable for good faith efforts.
5. Effective two-way communication was evident.

Institutional leaders used those incentives available to them to encourage and reward appropriate behavior--public praise, selection of academic administrators whose commitment was visible, distribution of extra dollars for recruitment and visiting lecturers and a few extra positions. In addition to persuasive powers, Denby and Newton presidents drew on their considerable personal and academic reputations to advance affirmative action reforms.

Administrators at all three campuses had the (dubious) advantage of beginning with a clearly recognizable problem. Newton, Denby, and CKSU started the decade of the 70s with extremely low female representation. These campuses were unlike Taylor's case sites where affirmative action

programs were never fully implemented because there had always been "some blacks and women" and therefore underrepresentation was never viewed as a compelling organizational problem. A widely recognized performance gap is helpful in mobilizing campus sentiment for change.

Coalition Group Activity on Behalf of Women

Newcombe's theory suggests that subsystems (such as a department) are more likely to implement policy if an effective change agent is present in the subsystem, yet this does not really address the issue of collective action focused at the institution-level rather than the subsystem-level. Taylor found coalition groups to be a positive impetus for organizational change, but her case studies did not delineate the ways in which their activities influenced policy, or interacted with other critical factors.

In this study, the decision to adopt AA policies was made by university administrators on all three campuses, but bottom-up pressure from women served an important function during subsequent stages of implementation. Women at Denby and Newton organized early on to press for change on behalf of all women on campus. Faculty women at CKSU organized several years later and they have been somewhat less successful in achieving demands despite a sympathetic reception from the Provost.

Although the current issues are different on each campus, there were similar patterns in the evolution of the groups and the strategies they pursued:

1. The targets of interest group activity are key leaders in the central administration. AA policies are perceived as university-wide concerns which the president and chief academic officer are in a position to influence.
2. On each campus, two or three senior women were repeatedly identified as playing a crucial role in articulating women's concerns and as providing credible leadership for the group in the eyes of male faculty and administrators and other women.

3. Women provided support for other women. They located women candidates, provided professional and personal support to increase retention, and worked individually and collectively to change male attitudes and policies which hindered women's progress.
4. Affirmative action implementation was directly assisted by women's groups which identified problems and proposed solutions.

Federal Intervention

Newcombe's theory views governmental intervention as a variable having a potential direct impact on every stage of the policy implementation process and an indirect impact through its effect on administrative leadership and conditions within campus units. Taylor also identified government action as a factor impelling organizations toward implementation of affirmative action.

At these three sites, federal intervention appears to have played its most useful role as a catalyst in the early stages of policy adoption and implementation. The three campuses were subject to different levels of scrutiny by federal investigators, although none reported receiving much useful assistance, especially in recent years.

Denby College made its decision to adopt the mandate and invest in its implementation without direct government intervention. Publication of the Revised Order in 1971 was a sufficient catalyst for already committed leaders. Newton's administrators faced a more serious threat to cut off federal funds. Although federal investigators periodically scrutinized Newton's affirmative action program, their intervention had little positive effect on implementation. Government oversight pervaded the administrative environment at CKSU. However, the evidence suggests that its most positive effect was in garnering the commitment of the Provost.

Environmental and Structural Influences on AA Implementation

Environmental variables play a minimal role in Newcombe's theory of mandated change. Government intervention was the only major influence

emanating from outside the institution. Taylor identified three variables-- social milieu, competitors' actions, and availability of women and minorities-- which could be considered environmental influences. Three other factors were intrinsic to the organization: identity of the organization, financial resources, and turnover of net additions. There are similarities in the list of environmental influences and structural changes generated from this study and those identified by Taylor.

An important change over the decade shared by all three institutions was the move to a coeducational student body. Newton University and CKSU were nominally coeducational but both experienced dramatic increases in female enrollment during the 1970s. Denby admitted women for the first time in 1972. Although the change was deliberate at Denby and Newton and fortuitous at CKSU, the consequences were much the same. Women became a more visible presence on campus. Highly competitive female students impressed skeptical male faculty in nontraditional disciplines and helped erode negative stereotypes. The presence of more women students legitimized demands for more women faculty.

Faculty expansion, particularly in areas where women doctorates were readily available, was also a facilitating factor. Although some faculty growth was evident at Denby and Newton, it played a smaller role in the constellation of factors at these two institutions than at CKSU.

Availability of qualified candidates is a precondition for success and explains to a certain degree why these three campuses reported far more effort expended on recruiting blacks than women, but were more successful in hiring women than blacks. Finally, campus reform efforts were connected to some extent to events and changes in the environment. The national climate supporting social justice reforms was a positive influence at Denby and

Newton. Changes in CKSU's surrounding community had an impact on the institution's growth and mission and indirectly benefitted women.

No one factor accounted for the full extent of change on any of the campuses. Rather, a constellation of factors and conditions allowed these institutions to make greater progress than their peer institutions in hiring women faculty. While absolute weights would be difficult to assign to each of the contributing elements, some clearly played a more important role than others. Existence of the federal mandate, leadership from a committed top administrator, creation of effective substructures to manage implementation, participation of women in the process, and close monitoring of the reform effort were vital elements of successful implementation. Stability of the top executive, availability of women doctorates, faculty expansion, increasing numbers of women students, and an internal and external environment conducive to change facilitated the effort to hire and promote women faculty.

Conclusions

Findings from the study contribute to the literature an organizational change and policy implementation in several ways. First, the case studies add to a growing body of knowledge about implementation experiences at specific universities. The influence of institutional context on policy adoption and implementation is not yet well understood and an accumulation of documented experiences may eventually lead to more useful generalizations. This is particularly true for policies like affirmative action that mandate change but provide no funds for implementation. This study focused on the identification of conditions which facilitate change and lead toward full implementation of the federal mandate. Findings from the case studies underline the critical importance of manipulable factors in creating positive change, especially the role of sustained effective leadership for the change

effort. This is encouraging evidence that serious attention to affirmative action can produce measurable gains.

Second, key factors identified at the three campuses corroborate the importance of certain theoretical variables identified by Newcombe (1981) and suggest ways in which her theory of mandated change might be modified. For instance, Newcombe suggests that the leadership variable is most important during the initial stages of adoption and implementation of a mandate. While leadership was crucial at the early stages in this study, the cases raise the question whether there is any point at which strong leadership from the top is not needed in order to maintain AA implementation. Affirmative action policies had been pursued for more than a decade at Newton and Denby, and nearly that long at CKSU. Yet nowhere were the policies so well institutionalized that top-level support could be withdrawn without jeopardizing the gains already made. The issue was raised most directly at Denby where a recent change in President and AA officer signaled a change in priority given to AA issues over the previous decade, but the personality dependence of the policies was evident on the other campuses as well.

These case findings also suggest that interest group activity is a variable of theoretical importance and should be incorporated in the model. Like leader behavior, interest group activity has many facets and closely interacts with other major variables. For instance, it is questionable whether an "effective" interest group can thrive in a hostile environment where the administration is not responsive to identified problems and pressure to change. The relative cohesiveness among women at Denby and Newton may be a function of the fact that they have had some success in getting administrators to make dozens of small and large changes at their request. Women's groups were also closely allied with structures designed

to implement affirmative action--the AA Office, special committees, and the ombudsman. Information on on-going and new problems was fed through the system so that appropriate action could be taken.

Environmental and structural changes also had an impact on the implementation process. They played a greater role at CKSU where resistance to affirmative action reforms was more widespread and ingrained, but they were present on the other two campuses as well. These facilitating conditions are not readily subsumed by any of the existing variables in Newcombe's model and their addition would give recognition to the importance of institutional context in the implementation process.

References

1. Lindquist, J. Strategies for Change. Berkeley, CA: Pacific Soundings Press, 1978.
2. Newcombe, J. P. A Theory of Prescribed Academic Change: The Case of Title IX (Doctoral dissertation, College of William and Mary, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1980, 41(2), 558-A. (University Microfilms No. 8017904).
3. _____, and C. F. Conrad. "A Theory of Mandated Academic Change." Journal of Higher Education, 52(1981), 555-577.
4. Schreirer, M. A. Program Implementation: The Organizational Context. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1981.
5. Taylor, M. L. The Role of the Staff Specialist in the Policy Implementation Process (Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1979). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1979, 40(3), 1593. (University Microfilms No. 7920984).
6. _____. "Implementing Affirmative Action: Impetus and Enabling Factors in Five Organizations." Research in Corporate Performance and Policy, 3(1981), 43-69.